

REMARKS

The Official Action of March 20, 2006, and the prior art cited and relied upon therein have been carefully studied. The claims in the application remain claims 1-6, and these claims define patentable subject matter warranting their allowance. Favorable reconsideration and such allowance are respectfully urged.

Claims 1-6 remain in the application for consideration.

Applicant respectfully traverses the Examiner's 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph rejection and objection which are based on the Examiner's indication that it is unclear how the broach cutting teeth that only cut on their bottom sides and have non-cutting sides can form profiles 15 and 16.

In response to this rejection and objection, Applicant submits that Fig. 3 in combination with the explanation starting at page 9, line 27 on through to page 11, line 3 provides the basis for the forming of profiles 15 and 16. As the Examiner will note on page 10, lines 20-21, the successive teeth only have a very small pitch in the range of 10 to 80 microns. Accordingly, each broach cutting tooth forms a chip which is peeled off from the flank at a depth

substantially equivalent to the pitch between the teeth. During this peeling action, the profile flanks are formed without the cutting action of the sides of the broach teeth, i.e. relieved edges 28a to 28f and edges 27a to 28a. Thus, peeling of consecutive chips at the bottom of the flank leads to forming of the profile flanks. During this formation, the bottom cutting action is accompanied by a tearing-away action of the emerging part of the flanks along the pitch.

The above-described action is conventional as clearly evidenced in Psenka, wherein col. 4, lines 10-15 indicate that, "the teeth ... cut primarily with their tops, and the sides of each teeth do not require hacking off,...."

Applicant respectfully submits that the Examiner's 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph rejection and objection to the drawings has now been overcome.

The Examiner has further rejected claims 1-6 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Psenka '919 in view of Applicant's Admitted Prior Art (AAPA). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection as applied to independent claim 1.

Applicant submits that Psenka does not teach:

- (1) Continuously extending second sides each
respectively extending over the entire height of
the respective broach cutting teeth which do not
touch the profile flank to which they face, and
- (2) Bottom cutting blades which each extend
continuously between the first and second sides
so that the cutting blade cuts over a full
profile width (b).

With regard to (1) above, it is clear that Psenka does not show continuously extending second sides being designed over the whole height of the broach cutting tooth as relieved surfaces which do not touch the profile flank. On the contrary, besides the relieved partial side 74 of tooth 70, the rest of the unnumbered seconds sides neighboring reference numeral 76 in Fig. 5 come into contact with the profile flank.

With regard to (2) above, Psenka does not teach bottom cutting blades extending between the first and second sides cutting over a full profile width. The Examiner refers to column 4 of Psenka, lines 52 to 55, in that respect. It is stated there that the second group of teeth, i.e. teeth E to G, "enlarge the slot to full width". This enlargement works step by step as it is described by Psenka in column 3, lines 67 ff. This enlargement of the whole profile flank works as

it is shown in Fig. 4 starting from a profile having a width D. Then a broach cutting teeth having a profile D plus a profile E broaches a profile part E. While broaching, only the E-part of the bottom cuts the profile. This "E-part" does not cut over the full profile width since the "D-part" does not participate in cutting. The same position holds for the enlargement steps with teeth F and G. Psenka's broaching therefore takes a lot of time compared to that of the claimed broach.

Applicant thanks the Examiner for her efforts in setting up our requested conference call with her and her supervisor. If Applicant's response does not place the application in condition for allowance, Applicant requests that the Examiner call to set up a conference call with her supervisor so that Applicant can better determine the Examiner's position and to offer further amendments to place the application in condition for allowance.

The prior art documents made of record and not relied upon have been noted along with the implication that such documents are deemed by the PTO to be insufficiently pertinent to warrant their applications against any of applicant's claims.

Appln. No. 10/725,410
Amdt. dated June 20, 2006
Reply to Office Action of March 20, 2006

Favorable reconsideration and allowance are
earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

BROWDY AND NEIMARK, P.L.L.C.
Attorneys for Applicant(s)

By N-12-1
Norman J. Latker
Registration No. 19,963

NJL:ma
Telephone No.: (202) 628-5197
Facsimile No.: (202) 737-3528
G:\BN\R\rau\Weghaus1\pto\2006-06-20 Amendment.doc